

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 - 9 are currently pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and reexamination in view of the following remarks.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,762,807 to Lee et al.; and claims 3 - 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al.

By this Response, no claims are amended; and the prior art rejection is traversed.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated August 23, 2005 are respectfully requested.

I. Claims 1 and 2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For a reference to anticipate an invention, all of the elements of the claimed invention must be present in the reference. The test for anticipation under section 102 is whether each and every element as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must also be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

It is respectfully submitted that Lee fails to teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in independent claim 1 of the present invention.

Independent Claim 1 of the present application recites a combination of elements, *inter alia*, "wherein said frame body and each of said extended parts are respectively

provided with at least one engaging element for coupling with a corresponding counterpart of a supporting frame used in the liquid crystal display device to fasten said side fixing frame with said supporting frame.”

Firstly, the Examiner mentions that Figure 3 of Lee et al. shows a side fixing frame comprising a frame body ( receptacle modules 410 and 420 of Lee et al. ) and a pair of extended parts forming a U-shaped configuration. After careful review of the citation, Applicants do not agree with the Examiner. In fact, the engaging recesses 414, 416, 424, 426 provided with the extended parts of Lee et al. are not substantially engaging elements. In other words, the citation of Lee et al. does not disclose or teach that each of the extended parts are provided with at least one engaging element as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Besides, the Examiner mentions that the frame body ( receptacle modules 410 and 420 of Lee et al. ) and each of the extended parts of Lee et al. are respectively provided with at least one engaging element ( 412, 422, engaging recesses 414, 416, 424 and 426 ) for coupling with a corresponding counterpart ( engaging screws 451, 454, 453 and 456; engaging holes 432, 434, 442 and 444 ) of a supporting frame ( 430, 440 ). Similarly, Applicants do not agree with the Examiner. Referring to Figure 3 of Lee et al., the engaging recesses 414, 416, 424 and 426 provided with the extended parts of Lee et al. are coupled with a corresponding counterpart ( engaging screws 451, 454, 453 and 456 combined with engaging holes 432, 434, 442 and 444 ) of a supporting frame ( 430, 440 ) of Lee et al. Applicants emphasize that the engaging recesses 414, 416, 424, 426 are not substantially engaging elements. In other words, the extended parts of Lee et al. are utilized as the engaging recesses instead of the engaging elements to couple with a corresponding counterpart of a supporting frame ( 430, 440 ) of Lee et al. Accordingly, the citation of Lee et al. does not disclose or teach that each of the

extended parts are provided with at least one engaging element for coupling with a corresponding counterpart of a supporting frame as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Moreover, it is noted that the engaging elements 412, 422 of the frame body of Lee et al. are not substantially coupled with a corresponding counterpart of a supporting frame ( 430, 440 ) of Lee et al. Similarly, the citation of Lee et al. does not disclose or teach that the frame body is provided with at least one engaging element for coupling with a corresponding counterpart of a supporting frame as in claim 1 of the present invention.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Lee et al. fails to teach the structure of claim 1 of the application.

Moreover, as claim 2 depends from independent claim 1, Applicants submit that this claim is allowable for at least similar reasons.

Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

II. Claims 3 - 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the Examiner must establish: (1) that some suggestion or motivation to modify the references exists; (2) a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) that the prior art references teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Fine*, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Wilson*, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).

Applicants respectfully submit that Lee et al. fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

As above mentioned, Lee et al. fails to teach the structure of claims 1 and 2 of the application. Claims 3 - 9 of the claimed invention add an additional limitation to claim 1 of the application. More importantly, there is no any motivation or suggestion indicating that Lee et al. suggests the claimed invention. Claims 3 - 9 are dependent on claim 1 and contain all of the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Accordingly, claims 3 - 9 are patentable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and the case be passed to issuance.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejection of claims 3 - 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

### III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the claims pending in the application comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) and 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) and patentably define over the applied art. A Notice of Allowance is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

Appl. No.: 10/801,688  
Art Unit: 2871  
Response to Office Action mailed  
August 23, 2005  
Attorney Docket No.: 26062

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 14-0112.

Respectfully submitted,

**NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC**

Date: November 22, 2005

By: 

NATH & ASSOCIATES PLLC  
1030 Fifteenth Street, N.W.  
Sixth Floor  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel. (202) 775-8383  
Fax. (202) 775-8396

Gary M. Nath  
Registration No. 26,965  
Gregory B. Kang  
Registration No. 45,273  
Teresa M. Arroyo  
Registration No. 50,015  
Customer No. 20259